

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TAMPA DIVISION**

LESLIE PAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 8:21-cv-568-KKM-SPF

UNITED STATES NAVY, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on consideration of the United States Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 4), filed on April 2, 2021, recommending that Plaintiff Marie Miller's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (Doc. 2) be denied. All parties were furnished copies of the Report and Recommendation and were afforded the opportunity to file objections under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections were filed. Considering the record and the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation; **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion; and **DISMISSES** the case **WITH PREJUDICE**.

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge may accept, reject, or modify a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files a timely and specific objection to a finding of fact by the magistrate judge, the district court must conduct a

de novo review with respect to that factual issue. *Stokes v. Singletary*, 952 F.2d 1567, 1576 (11th Cir. 1992). The district court reviews legal conclusions de novo, even in the absence of an objection. *See Cooper-Houston v. S. Ry. Co.*, 37 F.3d 603, 604 (11th Cir. 1994); *Ashworth v. Glades Cnty. Bd. of Cnty. Comm’rs*, 379 F. Supp. 3d 1244, 1246 (M.D. Fla. 2019).

In the absence of any objection and after reviewing all legal conclusions de novo, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation. The report recommends that Plaintiff’s request to proceed *in forma pauperis* be denied because Plaintiff’s complaint lacks sufficient facts to even infer a cognizable federal cause of action and is without “an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). The Court agrees that Plaintiff’s allegations are strange and clearly without merit. Plaintiff’s complaint contains many bizarre allegations involving special forces, the Royal family, and brain surgeries. (Doc. 1). Additionally, the Court agrees that given Plaintiff’s history of filing similar complaints across the country, Plaintiff could not state a nonfrivolous claim even if given leave to amend her complaint. *Gary v. U.S. Gov’t*, 540 F. App’x 916, 917 (11th Cir. 2013) (affirming dismissal of a complaint without leave to amend where the “allegations were irrational and wholly incredible”).

Accordingly, it is now **ORDERED**:

(1) The **Report** and **Recommendation** (Doc. 4) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** and is made a part of this Order for all purposes, including appellate review.

(2) Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis (Doc. 2) is **DENIED**.

(3) Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

(4) Plaintiff's Motion to Require Contempt of Court Money Owed (Doc. 3) is **DENIED** as moot.

(5) The Clerk is directed to terminate all pending motions and close the case.

**ORDERED** in Tampa, Florida, on April 20, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathryn Kimball Mizelle  
United States District Judge